

APPENDIX I

CATALOGING SURVEY DATA

SUMMARY

The data collected was not tested for statistical significance but there is a documented trend of consistent time savings in the creation of serial record bibliographic descriptions with the use of the access-level cataloging practice. For the set of 8 common titles cataloged by all libraries, the average time saved in the creation of a bibliographic description was 6.7 minutes (a 25% reduction). In addition, there is evidence of a learning curve in use of the access-level record (without a corresponding curve in control record creation) which indicates that future savings may be greater.

Including additional titles from their collections, individual libraries reported a time savings of between 5% and 35% in the creation of bibliographic descriptions. Individual catalogers generally commented positively on the time savings and the simplicity of the cataloging guidelines but expressed concerns that the guidelines needed more development. [Further development of certain guidelines and addition of examples is in process and will be included in the documentation to be used upon implementation.]

DATA COLLECTION

- 40 catalogers at 14 libraries reported on their cataloging activities by filling out an online survey.
- 376 cataloging instances were reported from March 14 to April 18, 2006.
- 21 cataloging instances were deleted due to reporting errors (duplicate entry, zero minute cataloging activity). An additional 28 cataloging instances were deleted as it was determined that the two catalogers from Libraries and Archives Canada reported estimated times. LAC cataloger comments are included in this report.
- The remaining 327 cataloging instances reported by 38 catalogers were imported to a spreadsheet for analysis.
- Harvard University statistical data was not used in analysis of the 8 common titles as cataloging activity was not distributed across the two catalogers (one cataloger created 8 control records, one cataloger created 6 control records and 2 access-level records). The Harvard data was included in larger analyses of cataloging activity.

SURVEY QUESTIONS & SUMMARY RESULTS

1. Cataloger ID

40 catalogers from 14 libraries were assigned unique institution-based identification codes.

2. Position

Of 40 catalogers:

36 (90%) identified as *Cataloging Librarians*

3 (7.5%) identified as *Cataloging Technicians*

1 (2.5%) identified as *Cataloging Student*

3. The purpose of this question is to determine the position of this title in the sequence in which you cataloged all of your titles for this pilot. Please indicate the sequential number for this title as an ordinal number (e.g., 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc.):

38 catalogers individually created anywhere between 2 and 20 records

Average number of records created by catalogers: 8.6 records

Median and mode number of records created by catalogers: 8 records

Catalogers	2	4	1	4	5	7	2	3	2	4	2	1	1
Records created	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15	20

Number of records created by each cataloger

Sequence	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th
Records created	39	37	38	35	30	32	26	21	15	13
Sequence	11th	12th	13th	14th	15th	16th	17th	18th	19th	20th
Records created	11	10	8	5	2	1	1	1	1	1

Number of records per identified sequence*

*Note: Anomalies resulted from one cataloger who identified reporting sequences separately for Control and Access-Level records (ie, first Control record and first Access-Level record were both identified as 1st in sequence).

4. Are you working on an Access Record or a Control Record? ("Access Records" follow the proposed cataloging guidelines; "Control Records" are those done to usual, local practice.)

5. Are you creating an Original Record (where no record currently exists in OCLC) or using Member Copy (improving/authenticating a non-CONSER record in OCLC)?

	Access-Level Cataloging	Control Cataloging
Original Record	134	122
Member Copy	33	38

Number of records by cataloging standard and original/copy

6. Is the title on which you are working in English, in a non-English Roman script, or a non-Roman script?

Of 327 records created/edited:

285 (87%) were for English-language serials

30 (9%) were for non-English Roman script serials

12 (4%) were for non-Roman script serials

7. Is the title on which you're working a print, microform, online, or CD-ROM resource?

Of 327 records created/edited:

226 (69%) were for print serials

100 (31%) were for online serials

1 (<1%) was for a CD-ROM serial

0 (0%) were for microform serials

8. How long (in whole minutes) did you spend on DESCRIPTIVE work when creating/authenticating or updating/authenticating the record in question? Exclude any interruptions.

For 327 records created/edited:

The shortest time to create/edit a bibliographic description: 2 minutes

The longest time to create/edit a bibliographic description: 165 minutes

Average time to create/edit a bibliographic description: 26.8 minutes

Median time to create/edit a bibliographic description: 21 minutes

Mode time to create/edit a bibliographic description: 20 minutes

	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
All records	23.7 (167)	30 (160)	6.3 (21%)
Original record	25.5 (134)	31.8 (122)	6.3 (20%)
Member copy	16.3 (33)	24.4 (38)	8.1 (33%)
English-language	22.9 (149)	29.5 (136)	6.6 (22%)
Non-English Roman Scripts	20.3 (12)	31.3 (18)	11 (35%)
Non-Roman Scripts	50.3 (6)*	38.3 (6)	-12 (-31%)
Print	22.9 (111)	29.4 (115)	6.5 (22%)
Online	25.6 (55)	31.5 (45)	5.9 (19%)

Time Reported To Create/Edit Bibliographic Description by Characteristic

**Discrepancy caused by an Arabic language record reported as taking 165 minutes.*

This title was not represented by a corresponding control record. Not including this outlier results in a time of 27.4 minutes with a comparable savings of 10.9 minutes (28%)

Sequence	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
1 st	29.3 (23)	28.2 (16)	-1.1 (-4%)
2 nd	27.3 (20)	40.3 (17)	13 (32%)
3 rd	21.1 (15)	28.7 (23)	7.6 (28%)
4 th	17.4 (18)	29.1 (17)	11.7 (40%)
5 th	25.1 (14)	26.9 (16)	1.8 (7%)
6 th	18.6 (14)	30.1 (18)	11.5 (38%)

7 th	24.5 (13)	36.8 (13)	12.3 (33%)
8 th	19.1 (12)	22.6 (9)	3.5 (15%)
9 th	29 (6)	24.1 (9)	-4.9 (-20%)
10 th	21.8 (6)	33 (7)	11.2 (34%)
11 th	19.5 (6)	32.6 (5)	13.1 (40%)
12 th	11 (5)	25.6 (5)	14.6 (57%)

Time Reported To Create/Edit Bibliographic Description by Sequence

9. How long (in whole minutes) did you spend on SUBJECT ANALYSIS and AUTHORITY WORK when creating/authenticating or updating/authenticating the record in question? Exclude any interruptions.

Of the 327 records created/edited, 170 were complete records which included subject analysis and/or authority control. For these 170 records:

The shortest time to supply subject analysis/authority control: 1 minute

The longest time to supply subject analysis/authority control: 170 minutes

Average time to supply subject analysis/authority control: 14.5 minutes

Median and mode time to supply subject analysis/authority control: 10 minutes

	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
All records	13.4 (86)	15.7 (84)	2.3 (15%)
Original record	14.6 (67)	16.6 (65)	2 (12%)
Member copy	9.1 (19)	12.4 (19)	3.3 (27%)
English-language	11.8 (68)	14.2 (64)	2.4 (17%)
Non-English Roman Scripts	23.5 (12)	26.4 (14)	2.9 (11%)
Non-Roman Scripts	11.5 (6)	6.8 (6)	-4.7 (-69%)
Print	14.4 (61)	17.2 (62)	2.8 (16%)
Online	11.5 (24)	11.5 (22)	0 (0%)

Time Spent on Subject Analysis and Authority Work

For the 170 complete records created (bibliographic description plus subject analysis and/or authority control):

The shortest time to create a complete record (incl. authority work): 5 minutes

The longest time to create a complete record (incl. authority work): 230 minutes

Average time to create a complete record (incl. authority work): 39.9 minutes

Median time to create a complete record (incl. authority work): 31 minutes

Mode times to create a complete record (incl. authority work): 25, 50 minutes

	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
All records	35.1 (86)	44.9 (84)	9.8 (22%)
Original record	37.3 (67)	45.7 (65)	8.4 (18%)
Member copy	27.4 (19)	42.1 (19)	14.7 (35%)
English-language	31.2 (68)	41.5 (64)	10.3 (24%)
Non-English	43.8 (12)	60.3 (14)	16.5 (27%)

Roman Scripts			
Non-Roman Scripts	61.8 (6)*	45.2 (6)	-16.6 (-37%)
Print	37.5 (61)	46.9 (62)	9.4 (20%)
Online	30.1 (24)	39 (22)	8.9 (23%)

Time Spent Creating/Editing Complete Records

**This discrepancy caused by an Arabic language record reported as taking 180 minutes. This title was not represented by a corresponding control record. Not including this outlier results in a time of 38.2 minutes with a comparable savings of 7 minutes (15%)*

10. Please help us identify the title you cataloged. If you've just worked with one of the eight common titles, please select that title. If you've worked with a different title, please add the OCLC# when it is available, or the title, when the OCLC# is not available. Please either choose one of the eight common titles, or add an OCLC# (when available) or the journal title.

Of 327 records created/edited:

191 (58%) were one of the eight common titles

136 (42%) were selected by the individual libraries

Because individual libraries selected titles based on their own collections and these selections made up a substantial portion of the cataloging reported:

- access/control comparisons with only the eight common titles are likely a more reliable indicator of cataloging time comparison
- inclusion of materials selected by individual libraries may provide a more accurate indicator of cataloging times for that library

	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
All common titles*	23 (88)	30.6 (87)**	7.6 (25%)

**Harvard data not included*

***One library omitted reporting one control record*

	Access-Level in minutes	Control in minutes	Savings in minutes
DLC/NSDP	16.5 (17)	25.4 (14)	8.9 (35%)
GPO	14.6 (14)	21.9 (14)	7.3 (33%)
Georgia	26.1 (14)	38.9 (14)	12.8 (32%)
UCLA	15.1 (13)	19 (13)	3.9 (30%)
Oklahoma State	24 (13)	32.3 (9)	8.3 (26%)
Columbia	12.6 (14)	16.8 (14)	4.2 (25%)
Florida	10 (4)	13.3 (6)	3.3 (25%)
NLM	36.4 (14)	47.6 (14)	11.2 (24%)
Washington	21.1 (15)	27.8 (14)	6.7 (24%)
NAL	38.6 (14)	48.6 (14)	10 (21%)
Harvard	28.1 (14)	32.7 (14)	4.6 (14%)
Stanford	7.9 (7)	8.3 (6)	0.4 (5%)
Chicago	40.1 (14)*	35.5 (14)	-4.6 (-13%)

Bibliographic Description Times For All Titles Cataloged By Library

**This discrepancy caused by an Arabic language record reported as taking 165 minutes. This title was not represented by a corresponding control record. Not including this outlier results in a time of 30.5 minutes with a comparable savings of 5 minutes (14%)*

11. When you created this Access Record, did you omit a Uniform Title that would have been required on a record done according to usual practice?

Following the access-level guidelines, of the 167 access-level records created/edited:

- 38 (23%) did not require a uniform title which would have been required following current CONSER practice
- 129 (77%) either did not require a uniform title under current CONSER practice or the cataloger added a uniform title according to the access-level guidelines

[Questions 12-13 contained cataloger's comments related to the creation of individual records. The text of all the comments can be found on the spreadsheets in Appendix K.]

14. If you'd like to add any general comments about the pilot or the guidelines, please do so here.

Pilot/Guidelines Suggestions

- With first issue in hand, unformatted 362s duplicate DBO. Especially in streamlined record this looks unnecessarily duplicative. Perhaps continue current practice of only DBO when not first issue in hand (and assume if no DBO then cataloger saw first issue).
- Guidelines about when uniform title should be used could be made a little clearer.
- The guidelines worked well for the pilot. But I think they will need to be fleshed out for general consumption.
- I wish the Mandatory Data Elements sheet included the fields that are explained in the separate document, Cataloging Guidelines, with a note to 'See Cataloging Guidelines' -- e.g. 260 \$c, Frequency and Regularity. It took me a few minutes (not counted in my cataloging time!) to find 260 \$c in the guidelines document.
- It would have been helpful if there had been some examples of Access Records (for examples a comparison of what an Access Record vs. a Control Record would look like)
- The guidelines seemed a little vague in the areas of fixed field, 362 and the notes usages. Examples would have helped.

Comments

- Not having to create uniform titles was great
- Not having to identify & transcribe place of publication was a time-saver
- Still wanted to provide SOR if not already in entry (1XX or 245[a|b]) but held back.
- Access level record is faster to complete compared to control level. However, there is a learning curve involved whereby one must remember to leave out fields that otherwise would have appeared on the record.

- As a CONSER cataloger, it's easier to catalog full level since I don't need the second thought of new guidelines. For certain difficult titles or complex conditions, the key of efficiency is not about the choice of access or full level but the judgment with a whole picture or problem-solving skills. If the title or headings are not heavily used by users or easy to identify, access level record does save some time for cataloging. However, for certain complex titles, the work of authority control is crucial for the information of problem-solving in the long run. We really have to consider all these perspectives for this project.
- As I am doing the control records, I find myself considering 'what does this record not have that might be included if I were doing it access level?'
- Doing an Access Level update to a non-Access record can result in an odd mix of inclusions and omissions.
- How can 362 be mandatory? What if you don't know when the serial began?
- I found the access level record is easier to create since it does not require extensive notes. Since I do not do routine serial cataloging, I cannot remember all those notes required for full/control cataloging
- I think this was a good project. I am glad to see access level records for serials.
- It was a little confusing to create records using two different sets of standards.
- Lack of examples in the guidelines to illustrate the differences between the two standards.
- Nice job on the 'Mandatory Data Elements.' Indeed, I am noticing that the following fields take up quite a bit of time: 007 color (for electronic resources), 246 subfield i, and 246 indicators.
- Re: 362, should we change roman numerals to arabic or leave as is? (I changed them.)
- This is a title that pointed up the difficulty for me of separating the authority, subject and descriptive cataloging in my ordinary practice. Normally, I would have moved back and forth between these activities as I finished the record.
- There's no question, access level records take less time to create. Are they better? Adequate? I'll be very interested to hear!
- Access level guidelines say to use 776|i rather than 530 to describe additional physical formats available, but if there is no bibliographical (or authority??) record for the other format, one has to use 530(?)
- Too bad this couldn't have been a bit better thought-out before we began. The pilot has definitely been a learning experience!

15. If you'd like to add any comments about this survey, please add them here.

It's easy to use.